
ENGROSSED HOUSE BILL 1563

State of Washington 58th Legislature 2003 Regular Session

By Representatives Lantz, Delvin, Dickerson, Carrell, Upthegrove, Talcott, Kessler, Kagi, McDermott, Lovick, Moeller, Morrell, Murray, Pettigrew, Berkey, Kenney and Santos

Read first time 01/30/2003. Referred to Committee on Juvenile Justice & Family Law.

- 1 AN ACT Relating to visitation rights for nonparents; amending RCW
- 2 26.09.160, 26.09.260, 26.09.240, and 26.10.160; adding a new section to
- 3 chapter 26.10 RCW; creating a new section; and declaring an emergency.
- 4 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON:
- 5 <u>NEW SECTION.</u> **Sec. 1.** The legislature affirms that parents have a
- 6 paramount right to raise their minor children. The legislature also
- 7 recognizes that this paramount right must be considered in conjunction
- 8 with a minor child's interest in maintaining the strong emotional bonds
- 9 with others that the child has developed and relies upon. Therefore,
- 10 the legislature intends to establish internally consistent and rigorous
- 11 standards that must be met for a nonparent to obtain visitation with a
- 12 minor child.
- NEW SECTION. Sec. 2. A new section is added to chapter 26.10 RCW
- 14 to read as follows:
- 15 (1) A nonparent may initiate a court proceeding for contact with a

p. 1 EHB 1563

child by filing a verified application to obtain court-ordered contact when all of the following criteria are satisfied:

- (a) The applicant is an individual with a parent-like relationship with the child. To satisfy this criterion, the applicant must show that:
- (i) His or her relationship with the child has been parental in nature for a substantial period of time;
 - (ii) A parent or custodian of the child consented to or allowed the formation and establishment of the relationship or the relationship was formed as a result of the unavailability or inability of any legal parent to perform caretaking functions; and
 - (iii) His or her relationship with the child is beneficial; and
 - (b) A parent or custodian has substantially interfered with the applicant's relationship with the child and the applicant has unsuccessfully attempted to resolve any disagreement with the parent or custodian before going to court.
 - (2)(a)(i) The court shall treat standing as a threshold issue. The applicant bears the burden of establishing standing. If the applicant does not satisfy this burden, the proceeding shall be dismissed.
 - (ii) Upon a finding that the applicant has standing, the applicant shall come forward with evidence to show that the child would very likely suffer harm if contact were not awarded. If the applicant presents evidence that could allow a reasonable factfinder to conclude that the child would very likely suffer harm, the burden shifts to the parent or custodian to present evidence why the decision to refuse contact is reasonable and in the best interests of the child.
- (b) The court shall order contact if it finds that the applicant has satisfied the burden of showing by clear and convincing evidence that:
- 30 (i) The child would very likely suffer harm if contact is not 31 awarded; and
 - (ii) The parent's or custodian's denial of contact was unreasonable and not in the child's best interests.
 - (3) If the court dismisses the proceeding for lack of standing, the court shall award reasonable and necessary costs and fees to the prevailing party unless there is a compelling reason to do otherwise. In all other cases, the court may award such costs and fees as it deems appropriate.

(4) If the parent or custodian fails to comply with a court order awarding contact between the nonparent and the child, the nonparent may file a motion to initiate a contempt action under RCW 26.09.160.

- (5) For purposes of this section, the following definitions apply:
- (a) "Applicant" means a nonparent who initiates a proceeding under this statute.
- (b) "Contact" includes all court-ordered arrangements by which a nonparent is authorized to interact with a child other than custody, conservatorship, guardianship, or joint or shared custody.
- (c) "Harm" means that denial of contact results in substantial loss and detriment to the child's physical, psychological, or emotional well-being. The likelihood of harm must be beyond the normal short-term distress a child suffers due to a change in circumstances.
- (d) "Nonparent" includes any person not legally recognized as a parent whether or not related by blood or marriage.
- (e) "Parent-like relationship" means a very significant relationship between a nonparent and a child in which the nonparent undertook responsibilities and tasks commonly performed by parents and commonly recognized as actions by someone in a parent-like relationship. Excluded from this category are baby-sitters or other employed caregivers.
- (f) "Substantially interfered" means to have unreasonably and greatly diminished the amount and quality of contact a nonparent has had with the child. A reasonable reduction in the frequency or length of contact previously enjoyed with the child is not a substantial interference.
- **Sec. 3.** RCW 26.09.160 and 1991 c 367 s 4 are each amended to read as follows:
 - (1) The performance of parental functions and the duty to provide child support are distinct responsibilities in the care of a child. If a party fails to comply with a provision of a decree or temporary order of injunction, the obligation of the other party to make payments for support or maintenance or to permit contact with children is not suspended. An attempt by a parent, in either the negotiation or the performance of a parenting plan, to condition one aspect of the parenting plan upon another, to condition payment of child support upon an aspect of the parenting plan, to refuse to pay ordered child

p. 3 EHB 1563

support, to refuse to perform the duties provided in the parenting plan, or to hinder the performance by the other parent of duties provided in the parenting plan, shall be deemed bad faith and shall be punished by the court by holding the party in contempt of court and by awarding to the aggrieved party reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incidental in bringing a motion for contempt of court.

- (2)(a) A motion may be filed to initiate a contempt action to coerce a parent to comply with an order establishing residential provisions for a child or awarding contact with a child to a nonparent under section 2 of this act. If the court finds there is reasonable cause to believe the parent has not complied with the order, the court may issue an order to show cause why the relief requested should not be granted.
- (b) If, based on all the facts and circumstances, the court finds after hearing that the parent, in bad faith, has not complied with the order establishing residential provisions for the child or awarding contact with a nonparent, the court shall find the parent in contempt of court. Upon a finding of contempt, the court shall order:
- (i) The noncomplying parent to provide the moving party additional time with the child. The additional time shall be equal to the time missed with the child, due to the parent's noncompliance;
- (ii) The parent to pay, to the moving party, all court costs and reasonable attorneys' fees incurred as a result of the noncompliance, and any reasonable expenses incurred in locating or returning a child; and
- (iii) The parent to pay, to the moving party, a civil penalty, not less than the sum of one hundred dollars.

The court may also order the parent to be imprisoned in the county jail, if the parent is presently able to comply with the provisions of the court-ordered parenting plan or court order awarding contact with a nonparent and is presently unwilling to comply. The parent may be imprisoned until he or she agrees to comply with the order, but in no event for more than one hundred eighty days.

(3) On a second failure within three years to comply with a residential provision of a court-ordered parenting plan or court order awarding contact with a nonparent, a motion may be filed to initiate contempt of court proceedings according to the procedure set forth in

subsection (2)(a) and (b) of this section. On a finding of contempt under this subsection, the court shall order:

1 2

- (a) The noncomplying parent to provide the other parent or party additional time with the child. The additional time shall be twice the amount of the time missed with the child, due to the parent's noncompliance;
- (b) The noncomplying parent to pay, to the other parent or party, all court costs and reasonable attorneys' fees incurred as a result of the noncompliance, and any reasonable expenses incurred in locating or returning a child; and
- (c) The noncomplying parent to pay, to the moving party, a civil penalty of not less than two hundred fifty dollars.

The court may also order the parent to be imprisoned in the county jail, if the parent is presently able to comply with the provisions of the court-ordered parenting plan or court order awarding contact with a nonparent and is presently unwilling to comply. The parent may be imprisoned until he or she agrees to comply with the order but in no event for more than one hundred eighty days.

- (4) For purposes of subsections (1), (2), and (3) of this section, the parent shall be deemed to have the present ability to comply with the order establishing residential provisions or awarding contact with a nonparent unless he or she establishes otherwise by a preponderance of the evidence. The parent shall establish a reasonable excuse for failure to comply with the court-ordered contact with a nonparent or the residential provision of a court-ordered parenting plan by a preponderance of the evidence.
- (5) Any monetary award ordered under subsections (1), (2), and (3) of this section may be enforced, by the party to whom it is awarded, in the same manner as a civil judgment.
- (6) Subsections (1), (2), and (3) of this section authorize the exercise of the court's power to impose remedial sanctions for contempt of court and is in addition to any other contempt power the court may possess.
- (7) Upon motion for contempt of court under subsections (1) through (3) of this section, if the court finds the motion was brought without reasonable basis, the court shall order the moving party to pay to the nonmoving party, all costs, reasonable attorneys' fees, and a civil penalty of not less than one hundred dollars.

p. 5 EHB 1563

- Sec. 4. RCW 26.09.260 and 2000 c 21 s 19 are each amended to read as follows:
 - (1) Except as otherwise provided in subsections (4), (5), (6), (8), and (10) of this section, the court shall not modify a prior custody decree or a parenting plan unless it finds, upon the basis of facts that have arisen since the prior decree or plan or that were unknown to the court at the time of the prior decree or plan, that a substantial change has occurred in the circumstances of the child or the nonmoving party and that the modification is in the best interest of the child and is necessary to serve the best interests of the child.
 - (2) In applying these standards, the court shall retain the residential schedule established by the decree or parenting plan unless:
 - (a) The parents agree to the modification;

- (b) The child has been integrated into the family of the petitioner with the consent of the other parent in substantial deviation from the parenting plan;
- (c) The child's present environment is detrimental to the child's physical, mental, or emotional health and the harm likely to be caused by a change of environment is outweighed by the advantage of a change to the child; or
- (d) The court has found the nonmoving parent in contempt of court at least twice within three years because the parent failed to comply with a court order awarding contact with a nonparent or the parent failed to comply with the residential time provisions in the court-ordered parenting plan, or the parent has been convicted of custodial interference in the first or second degree under RCW 9A.40.060 or 9A.40.070.
- (3) A conviction of custodial interference in the first or second degree under RCW 9A.40.060 or 9A.40.070 shall constitute a substantial change of circumstances for the purposes of this section.
- (4) The court may reduce or restrict contact between the child and the parent with whom the child does not reside a majority of the time if it finds that the reduction or restriction would serve and protect the best interests of the child using the criteria in RCW 26.09.191.
- 36 (5) The court may order adjustments to the residential aspects of 37 a parenting plan upon a showing of a substantial change in 38 circumstances of either parent or of the child, and without

consideration of the factors set forth in subsection (2) of this section, if the proposed modification is only a minor modification in the residential schedule that does not change the residence the child is scheduled to reside in the majority of the time and:

- (a) Does not exceed twenty-four full days in a calendar year; or
- (b) Is based on a change of residence of the parent with whom the child does not reside the majority of the time or an involuntary change in work schedule by a parent which makes the residential schedule in the parenting plan impractical to follow; or
- (c) Does not result in a schedule that exceeds ninety overnights per year in total, if the court finds that, at the time the petition for modification is filed, the decree of dissolution or parenting plan does not provide reasonable time with the parent with whom the child does not reside a majority of the time, and further, the court finds that it is in the best interests of the child to increase residential time with the parent in excess of the residential time period in (a) of this subsection. However, any motion under this subsection (5)(c) is subject to the factors established in subsection (2) of this section if the party bringing the petition has previously been granted a modification under this same subsection within twenty-four months of the current motion. Relief granted under this section shall not be the sole basis for adjusting or modifying child support.
- (6) The court may order adjustments to the residential aspects of a parenting plan pursuant to a proceeding to permit or restrain a relocation of the child. The person objecting to the relocation of the child or the relocating person's proposed revised residential schedule may file a petition to modify the parenting plan, including a change of the residence in which the child resides the majority of the time, without a showing of adequate cause other than the proposed relocation itself. A hearing to determine adequate cause for modification shall not be required so long as the request for relocation of the child is being pursued. In making a determination of a modification pursuant to relocation of the child, the court shall first determine whether to permit or restrain the relocation of the child using the procedures and standards provided in RCW 26.09.405 through 26.09.560. Following that determination, the court shall determine what modification pursuant to relocation should be made, if any, to the parenting plan or custody order or visitation order.

p. 7 EHB 1563

(7) A parent with whom the child does not reside a majority of the time and whose residential time with the child is subject to limitations pursuant to RCW 26.09.191 (2) or (3) may not seek expansion of residential time under subsection (5)(c) of this section unless that parent demonstrates a substantial change in circumstances specifically related to the basis for the limitation.

- (8) If a parent with whom the child does not reside a majority of the time voluntarily fails to exercise residential time for an extended period, that is, one year or longer, the court upon proper motion may make adjustments to the parenting plan in keeping with the best interests of the minor child.
- (9) A parent with whom the child does not reside a majority of the time who is required by the existing parenting plan to complete evaluations, treatment, parenting, or other classes may not seek expansion of residential time under subsection (5)(c) of this section unless that parent has fully complied with such requirements.
- (10) The court may order adjustments to any of the nonresidential aspects of a parenting plan upon a showing of a substantial change of circumstances of either parent or of a child, and the adjustment is in the best interest of the child. Adjustments ordered under this section may be made without consideration of the factors set forth in subsection (2) of this section.
- (11) If the court finds that a motion to modify a prior decree or parenting plan has been brought in bad faith, the court shall assess the attorney's fees and court costs of the nonmoving parent against the moving party.
- **Sec. 5.** RCW 26.09.240 and 1996 c 177 s 1 are each amended to read 28 as follows:
 - ((\(\frac{1}{1}\))) Under section 2 of this act, a person other than a parent may petition the court for visitation with a child ((at any time)) or may intervene in a pending dissolution, legal separation, or modification of parenting plan proceeding. ((A person other than a parent may not petition for visitation under this section unless the child's parent or parents have commenced an action under this chapter.
- 35 (2) A petition for visitation with a child by a person other than 36 a parent must be filed in the county in which the child resides.

- (3) A petition for visitation or a motion to intervene pursuant to this section shall be dismissed unless the petitioner or intervenor can demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that a significant relationship exists with the child with whom visitation is sought. If the petition or motion is dismissed for failure to establish the existence of a significant relationship, the petitioner or intervenor shall be ordered to pay reasonable attorney's fees and costs to the parent, parents, other custodian, or representative of the child who responds to this petition or motion.
- (4) The court may order visitation between the petitioner or intervenor and the child between whom a significant relationship exists upon a finding supported by the evidence that the visitation is in the child's best interests.
- (5)(a) Visitation with a grandparent shall be presumed to be in the child's best interests when a significant relationship has been shown to exist. This presumption may be rebutted by a preponderance of evidence showing that visitation would endanger the child's physical, mental, or emotional health.
- (b) If the court finds that reasonable visitation by a grandparent would be in the child's best interest except for hostilities that exist between the grandparent and one or both of the parents or person with whom the child lives, the court may set the matter for mediation under RCW 26.09.015.
- (6) The court may consider the following factors when making a determination of the child's best interests:
- (a) The strength of the relationship between the child and the petitioner;
- (b) The relationship between each of the child's parents or the person with whom the child is residing and the petitioner;
- (c) The nature and reason for either parent's objection to granting the petitioner visitation;
- (d) The effect that granting visitation will have on the relationship between the child and the child's parents or the person with whom the child is residing;
- (e) The residential time sharing arrangements between the parents;
- 36 (f) The good faith of the petitioner;

2.2

37 (g) Any criminal history or history of physical, emotional, or
38 sexual abuse or neglect by the petitioner; and

p. 9 EHB 1563

(h) Any other factor relevant to the child's best interest.

1

3

4 5

6 7

8

17

18 19

2021

22

23

24

2526

27

28

32

3334

- (7) The restrictions of RCW 26.09.191 that apply to parents shall be applied to a petitioner or intervenor who is not a parent. The nature and extent of visitation, subject to these restrictions, is in the discretion of the court.
 - (8) The court may order an investigation and report concerning the proposed visitation or may appoint a guardian ad litem as provided in RCW 26.09.220.
- 9 (9) Visitation granted pursuant to this section shall be incorporated into the parenting plan for the child.
- 11 (10) The court may modify or terminate visitation rights granted 12 pursuant to this section in any subsequent modification action upon a 13 showing that the visitation is no longer in the best interest of the 14 child.))
- 15 **Sec. 6.** RCW 26.10.160 and 1996 c 303 s 2 are each amended to read 16 as follows:
 - (1) A parent not granted custody of the child is entitled to reasonable visitation rights except as provided in subsection (2) of this section.
 - (2)(a) Visitation with the child shall be limited if it is found that the parent seeking visitation has engaged in any of the following conduct: (i) Willful abandonment that continues for an extended period of time or substantial refusal to perform parenting functions; (ii) physical, sexual, or a pattern of emotional abuse of a child; (iii) a history of acts of domestic violence as defined in RCW 26.50.010(1) or an assault or sexual assault which causes grievous bodily harm or the fear of such harm; or (iv) the parent has been convicted as an adult of a sex offense under:
- 29 (A) RCW 9A.44.076 if, because of the difference in age between the 30 offender and the victim, no rebuttable presumption exists under (d) of this subsection;
 - (B) RCW 9A.44.079 if, because of the difference in age between the offender and the victim, no rebuttable presumption exists under (d) of this subsection;
- 35 (C) RCW 9A.44.086 if, because of the difference in age between the 36 offender and the victim, no rebuttable presumption exists under (d) of 37 this subsection;

- 1 (D) RCW 9A.44.089;
- 2 (E) RCW 9A.44.093;
- 3 (F) RCW 9A.44.096;

15 16

17

18

19 20

2122

2627

28

32

38

- 4 (G) RCW 9A.64.020 (1) or (2) if, because of the difference in age 5 between the offender and the victim, no rebuttable presumption exists 6 under (d) of this subsection;
 - (H) Chapter 9.68A RCW;
- 8 (I) Any predecessor or antecedent statute for the offenses listed 9 in (a)(iv)(A) through (H) of this subsection;
- 10 (J) Any statute from any other jurisdiction that describes an 11 offense analogous to the offenses listed in (a)(iv)(A) through (H) of this subsection.
- This subsection (2)(a) shall not apply when (c) or (d) of this subsection applies.
 - (b) The parent's visitation with the child shall be limited if it is found that the parent resides with a person who has engaged in any of the following conduct: (i) Physical, sexual, or a pattern of emotional abuse of a child; (ii) a history of acts of domestic violence as defined in RCW 26.50.010(1) or an assault or sexual assault that causes grievous bodily harm or the fear of such harm; or (iii) the person has been convicted as an adult or as a juvenile has been adjudicated of a sex offense under:
- (A) RCW 9A.44.076 if, because of the difference in age between the offender and the victim, no rebuttable presumption exists under (e) of this subsection;
 - (B) RCW 9A.44.079 if, because of the difference in age between the offender and the victim, no rebuttable presumption exists under (e) of this subsection;
- (C) RCW 9A.44.086 if, because of the difference in age between the offender and the victim, no rebuttable presumption exists under (e) of this subsection;
 - (D) RCW 9A.44.089;
- 33 (E) RCW 9A.44.093;
- 34 (F) RCW 9A.44.096;
- 35 (G) RCW 9A.64.020 (1) or (2) if, because of the difference in age 36 between the offender and the victim, no rebuttable presumption exists 37 under (e) of this subsection;
 - (H) Chapter 9.68A RCW;

p. 11 EHB 1563

- 1 (I) Any predecessor or antecedent statute for the offenses listed 2 in (b)(iii)(A) through (H) of this subsection;
 - (J) Any statute from any other jurisdiction that describes an offense analogous to the offenses listed in (b)(iii)(A) through (H) of this subsection.

This subsection (2)(b) shall not apply when (c) or (e) of this subsection applies.

- (c) If a parent has been found to be a sexual predator under chapter 71.09 RCW or under an analogous statute of any other jurisdiction, the court shall restrain the parent from contact with a child that would otherwise be allowed under this chapter. If a parent resides with an adult or a juvenile who has been found to be a sexual predator under chapter 71.09 RCW or under an analogous statute of any other jurisdiction, the court shall restrain the parent from contact with the parent's child except contact that occurs outside that person's presence.
- (d) There is a rebuttable presumption that a parent who has been convicted as an adult of a sex offense listed in (d)(i) through (ix) of this subsection poses a present danger to a child. Unless the parent rebuts this presumption, the court shall restrain the parent from contact with a child that would otherwise be allowed under this chapter:
- 23 (i) RCW 9A.64.020 (1) or (2), provided that the person convicted 24 was at least five years older than the other person;
- 25 (ii) RCW 9A.44.073;

3

4

6 7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

2122

- 26 (iii) RCW 9A.44.076, provided that the person convicted was at least eight years older than the victim;
- 28 (iv) RCW 9A.44.079, provided that the person convicted was at least 29 eight years older than the victim;
- 30 (v) RCW 9A.44.083;
- (vi) RCW 9A.44.086, provided that the person convicted was at least eight years older than the victim;
- 33 (vii) RCW 9A.44.100;
- (viii) Any predecessor or antecedent statute for the offenses listed in (d)(i) through (vii) of this subsection;
- (ix) Any statute from any other jurisdiction that describes an offense analogous to the offenses listed in (d)(i) through (vii) of this subsection.

- (e) There is a rebuttable presumption that a parent who resides with a person who, as an adult, has been convicted, or as a juvenile has been adjudicated, of the sex offenses listed in (e)(i) through (ix) of this subsection places a child at risk of abuse or harm when that parent exercises visitation in the presence of the convicted or adjudicated person. Unless the parent rebuts the presumption, the court shall restrain the parent from contact with the parent's child except for contact that occurs outside of the convicted or adjudicated person's presence:
- 10 (i) RCW 9A.64.020 (1) or (2), provided that the person convicted 11 was at least five years older than the other person;
- 12 (ii) RCW 9A.44.073;

3

4 5

6 7

8

17

28

29

3031

32

33

34

35

3637

38

- 13 (iii) RCW 9A.44.076, provided that the person convicted was at least eight years older than the victim;
- 15 (iv) RCW 9A.44.079, provided that the person convicted was at least 16 eight years older than the victim;
 - (v) RCW 9A.44.083;
- 18 (vi) RCW 9A.44.086, provided that the person convicted was at least 19 eight years older than the victim;
- 20 (vii) RCW 9A.44.100;
- (viii) Any predecessor or antecedent statute for the offenses listed in (e)(i) through (vii) of this subsection;
- (ix) Any statute from any other jurisdiction that describes an offense analogous to the offenses listed in (e)(i) through (vii) of this subsection.
- 26 (f) The presumption established in (d) of this subsection may be 27 rebutted only after a written finding that:
 - (i) If the child was not the victim of the sex offense committed by the parent requesting visitation, (A) contact between the child and the offending parent is appropriate and poses minimal risk to the child, and (B) the offending parent has successfully engaged in treatment for sex offenders or is engaged in and making progress in such treatment, if any was ordered by a court, and the treatment provider believes such contact is appropriate and poses minimal risk to the child; or
 - (ii) If the child was the victim of the sex offense committed by the parent requesting visitation, (A) contact between the child and the offending parent is appropriate and poses minimal risk to the child, (B) if the child is in or has been in therapy for victims of sexual

p. 13 EHB 1563

abuse, the child's counselor believes such contact between the child and the offending parent is in the child's best interest, and (C) the offending parent has successfully engaged in treatment for sex offenders or is engaged in and making progress in such treatment, if any was ordered by a court, and the treatment provider believes such contact is appropriate and poses minimal risk to the child.

1 2

- (g) The presumption established in (e) of this subsection may be rebutted only after a written finding that:
- (i) If the child was not the victim of the sex offense committed by the person who is residing with the parent requesting visitation, (A) contact between the child and the parent residing with the convicted or adjudicated person is appropriate and that parent is able to protect the child in the presence of the convicted or adjudicated person, and (B) the convicted or adjudicated person has successfully engaged in treatment for sex offenders or is engaged in and making progress in such treatment, if any was ordered by a court, and the treatment provider believes such contact is appropriate and poses minimal risk to the child; or
- (ii) If the child was the victim of the sex offense committed by the person who is residing with the parent requesting visitation, (A) contact between the child and the parent in the presence of the convicted or adjudicated person is appropriate and poses minimal risk to the child, (B) if the child is in or has been in therapy for victims of sexual abuse, the child's counselor believes such contact between the child and the parent residing with the convicted or adjudicated person in the presence of the convicted or adjudicated person is in the child's best interest, and (C) the convicted or adjudicated person has successfully engaged in treatment for sex offenders or is engaged in and making progress in such treatment, if any was ordered by a court, and the treatment provider believes contact between the parent and child in the presence of the convicted or adjudicated person is appropriate and poses minimal risk to the child.
- (h) If the court finds that the parent has met the burden of rebutting the presumption under (f) of this subsection, the court may allow a parent who has been convicted as an adult of a sex offense listed in (d)(i) through (ix) of this subsection to have visitation with the child supervised by a neutral and independent adult and pursuant to an adequate plan for supervision of such visitation. The

court shall not approve of a supervisor for contact between the child and the parent unless the court finds, based on the evidence, that the supervisor is willing and capable of protecting the child from harm. The court shall revoke court approval of the supervisor upon finding, based on the evidence, that the supervisor has failed to protect the child or is no longer willing or capable of protecting the child.

1 2

- (i) If the court finds that the parent has met the burden of rebutting the presumption under (g) of this subsection, the court may allow a parent residing with a person who has been adjudicated as a juvenile of a sex offense listed in (e)(i) through (ix) of this subsection to have visitation with the child in the presence of the person adjudicated as a juvenile, supervised by a neutral and independent adult and pursuant to an adequate plan for supervision of such visitation. The court shall not approve of a supervisor for contact between the child and the parent unless the court finds, based on the evidence, that the supervisor is willing and capable of protecting the child from harm. The court shall revoke court approval of the supervisor upon finding, based on the evidence, that the supervisor has failed to protect the child or is no longer willing or capable of protecting the child.
- (j) If the court finds that the parent has met the burden of rebutting the presumption under (g) of this subsection, the court may allow a parent residing with a person who, as an adult, has been convicted of a sex offense listed in (e)(i) through (ix) of this subsection to have visitation with the child in the presence of the convicted person supervised by a neutral and independent adult and pursuant to an adequate plan for supervision of such visitation. The court shall not approve of a supervisor for contact between the child and the parent unless the court finds, based on the evidence, that the supervisor is willing and capable of protecting the child from harm. The court shall revoke court approval of the supervisor upon finding, based on the evidence, that the supervisor has failed to protect the child or is no longer willing or capable of protecting the child.
- (k) A court shall not order unsupervised contact between the offending parent and a child of the offending parent who was sexually abused by that parent. A court may order unsupervised contact between the offending parent and a child who was not sexually abused by the parent after the presumption under (d) of this subsection has been

p. 15 EHB 1563

rebutted and supervised visitation has occurred for at least two years 1 with no further arrests or convictions of sex offenses involving 2 children under chapter 9A.44 RCW, RCW 9A.64.020, or chapter 9.68A RCW 3 and (i) the sex offense of the offending parent was not committed 4 against a child of the offending parent, and (ii) the court finds that 5 unsupervised contact between the child and the offending parent is 6 7 appropriate and poses minimal risk to the child, after consideration of the testimony of a state-certified therapist, mental health counselor, 8 or social worker with expertise in treating child sexual abuse victims 9 10 who has supervised at least one period of visitation between the parent and the child, and after consideration of evidence of the offending 11 12 parent's compliance with community supervision requirements, if any. 13 If the offending parent was not ordered by a court to participate in shall obtain a 14 treatment for sex offenders, then the parent psychosexual evaluation conducted by a state-certified sex offender 15 treatment provider indicating that the offender has the lowest 16 likelihood of risk to reoffend before the court grants unsupervised 17 contact between the parent and a child. 18

(1) A court may order unsupervised contact between the parent and a child which may occur in the presence of a juvenile adjudicated of a sex offense listed in (e)(i) through (ix) of this subsection who resides with the parent after the presumption under (e) of this subsection has been rebutted and supervised visitation has occurred for at least two years during which time the adjudicated juvenile has had no further arrests, adjudications, or convictions of sex offenses involving children under chapter 9A.44 RCW, RCW 9A.64.020, or chapter 9.68A RCW, and (i) the court finds that unsupervised contact between the child and the parent that may occur in the presence of the adjudicated juvenile is appropriate and poses minimal risk to the child, after consideration of the testimony of a state-certified therapist, mental health counselor, or social worker with expertise in treatment of child sexual abuse victims who has supervised at least one period of visitation between the parent and the child in the presence of the adjudicated juvenile, and after consideration of evidence of the adjudicated juvenile's compliance with community supervision or parole requirements, if any. If the adjudicated juvenile was not ordered by a court to participate in treatment for sex offenders, then the adjudicated juvenile shall obtain a psychosexual evaluation conducted

EHB 1563 p. 16

19

2021

22

2324

25

2627

28

29

30

3132

33

34

35

3637

38

by a state-certified sex offender treatment provider indicating that the adjudicated juvenile has the lowest likelihood of risk to reoffend before the court grants unsupervised contact between the parent and a child which may occur in the presence of the adjudicated juvenile who is residing with the parent.

(m)(i) The limitations imposed by the court under (a) or (b) of this subsection shall be reasonably calculated to protect the child from the physical, sexual, or emotional abuse or harm that could result if the child has contact with the parent requesting visitation. If the court expressly finds based on the evidence that limitations on visitation with the child will not adequately protect the child from the harm or abuse that could result if the child has contact with the parent requesting visitation, the court shall restrain the person seeking visitation from all contact with the child.

(ii) The court shall not enter an order under (a) of this subsection allowing a parent to have contact with a child if the parent has been found by clear and convincing evidence in a civil action or by a preponderance of the evidence in a dependency action to have sexually abused the child, except upon recommendation by an evaluator or therapist for the child that the child is ready for contact with the parent and will not be harmed by the contact. The court shall not enter an order allowing a parent to have contact with the child in the offender's presence if the parent resides with a person who has been found by clear and convincing evidence in a civil action or by a preponderance of the evidence in a dependency action to have sexually abused a child, unless the court finds that the parent accepts that the person engaged in the harmful conduct and the parent is willing to and capable of protecting the child from harm from the person.

(iii) If the court limits visitation under (a) or (b) of this subsection to require supervised contact between the child and the parent, the court shall not approve of a supervisor for contact between a child and a parent who has engaged in physical, sexual, or a pattern of emotional abuse of the child unless the court finds based upon the evidence that the supervisor accepts that the harmful conduct occurred and is willing to and capable of protecting the child from harm. The court shall revoke court approval of the supervisor upon finding, based on the evidence, that the supervisor has failed to protect the child or is no longer willing to or capable of protecting the child.

p. 17 EHB 1563

- (n) If the court expressly finds based on the evidence that 1 2 contact between the parent and the child will not cause physical, sexual, or emotional abuse or harm to the child and that the 3 probability that the parent's or other person's harmful or abusive 4 conduct will recur is so remote that it would not be in the child's 5 best interests to apply the limitations of (a), (b), and (m)(i) and 6 7 (iii) of this subsection, or if the court expressly finds that the parent's conduct did not have an impact on the child, then the court 8 need not apply the limitations of (a), (b), and (m)(i) and (iii) of 9 10 this subsection. The weight given to the existence of a protection order issued under chapter 26.50 RCW as to domestic violence is within 11 the discretion of the court. This subsection shall not apply when (c), 12 13 (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), and (m)(ii) of this 14 subsection apply.
 - (3) ((Any person may petition the court for visitation rights at any time including, but not limited to, custody proceedings. The court may order visitation rights for any person when visitation may serve the best interest of the child whether or not there has been any change of circumstances.)) A person other than a parent may petition the court for visitation with a child under section 2 of this act.
 - (4) The court may modify an order granting or denying visitation rights whenever modification would serve the best interests of the child. Modification of a parent's visitation rights shall be subject to the requirements of subsection (2) of this section.
- 25 (5) For the purposes of this section, a parent's child means that 26 parent's natural child, adopted child, or stepchild.
- NEW SECTION. Sec. 7. This act is necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, or safety, or support of the state government and its existing public institutions, and takes effect immediately.

--- END ---

EHB 1563 p. 18

15 16

17

18

19

20

2122

2324